

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/751,124 01/03/2004		Terrance Patrick Riney	P026483-01PV 1757		
75	90 03/24/2006	EXAMINER			
Terrance P. Riney 9209 Seminole Blyd #88			NGUYEN, TAN QUANG		
Seminole, FL		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,		3661			

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application	No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/751,124		RINEY, TERRANCE PATRICK					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
			TAN Q. NGU	YEN	3661				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SHORTENED WHICHEVER IS - Extensions of time ma after SIX (6) MONTH! - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within Any reply received by	STATUTORY PERIOD IN LONGER, FROM THE IN US be available under the provision of from the mailing date of this come is specified above, the maximum set he set or extended period for replete Office later than three months ljustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. ttatutory period will y will, by statute, c	TE OF THIS 6(a). In no event, Il apply and will excause the applicat	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be time pire SIX (6) MONTHS from ion to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)⊠ Responsive 2a)□ This action	e to communication(s) fil is <b>FINAL</b> .	ed on <u>27 <i>Jan</i></u> 2b)⊠ This a		-final.					
3)☐ Since this a	application is in condition	n for allowand	ce except for	formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is			
closed in a	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Clain	ıs								
4a) Of the a 5) ☐ Claim(s) _ 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>5</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) _	<ul> <li>20 is/are pending in the bove claim(s) 1-4 and 8</li> <li>is/are allowed.</li> <li>is/are rejected.</li> <li>is/are objected to.</li> <li>are subject to restrict</li> </ul>	<u>-20</u> is/are wit							
Application Papers									
10) The drawing Applicant ma	ration is objected to by the g(s) filed on 03 January and request that any object drawing sheet(s) including declaration is objected to	2004 is/are: ection to the dr g the correctio	a)⊠ accept rawing(s) be t on is required	neld in abeyance. See if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
	on's Patent Drawing Review ( ure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o		5) 6)	=	ate	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/751,124

Art Unit: 3661

#### **DETAIL ACTION**

### Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This office action is response to the Letter filed on January 27, 2006 which selected Group II, claims 5-7 without traverse. Thus, the claims 1-4 and 8-20 have been withdrawn as to non-elected claims.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
- 3. The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.
- 5. As per claim 5, there is no description of the nine individual maps can be found in the specification as well as the drawing. In figure 7, it shows 12 maps and depends on the direction of the traveling, 3 maps are loaded into the computer memory.
- 6. As per claims 6 and 7, similar to the above, no where can be found in the application show that only map in center of nine maps is visible and the limitation in claim 7.

. .

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/751,124

Art Unit: 3661

11

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

- 8. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 9. As per claim 5, line 1, the phrase "said gear" has no antecedent basis.

  Furthermore, the limitation "nine individual maps are loaded in Random Access

  Memory" is unclear as to the nine individual maps are not defined properly.
- 10. As per claim 6, the phrase "movement in north, south, east, or west will load 3 maps and unload 3 maps" is unclear because as recited in claim 5, "nine individual maps are loaded", and now 3 more maps will be loaded and 3 more maps will be unloaded? Which maps are they? Clarification is needed.
- 11. As per claim 7, the limitation of this claim in unclear as to what the is relationship between the 3 loaded maps, 3 unloaded maps and the nine individual loaded map. Clarification is requested.
- 12. The following rejections are based on the examiner's best interpretation of the claims in light of the 35 U.S.C. 112 errors noted above.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/751,124

Art Unit: 3661

14. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takanabe et al. (4,571,684).

15. With respect to claim 5, Takanabe et al. disclose a map display system in a navigation which has nine individual maps as shown in the figure 12.

Takanabe et al. do not explicitly disclose that such nine maps are loaded in the RAM. However, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that in order to display such maps, they are first loaded into the RAM for the display means to display such maps.

16. With respect to claims 6 and 7, Takanabe et al. disclose that the map in the center is visible (see figure 12). Takanabe et al. do not explicitly disclose that the 3 maps in that direction are load, and the 3 maps in the opposite direction are unloaded. However, from figure 12, when the vehicle move north, at the area A, B, and C of map 1, which overlap the with maps 2, 3, and 4. If only 3 maps are allowed to be loaded, it would be obvious that such maps 2, 3 and 4 are loaded, and those maps in the south, which are 6, 7, 8 should be unloaded because of the direction of the traveling. It would have been motivated one of ordinary skill to load the 3 maps of that travel direction each time in compare with loading all nine maps in order to improving the displaying time, and thus improving the display system.

#### Conclusion

- 17. All claims are rejected.
- 18. The following references are cited as being of general interest: Ichikawa (4,630,065), Dawson et al. (4,876,651), Mattingly (5,150,295), Kawaiwazaki et al. (5,157,614), Arkawa et al. (5,396,430), Ichikawa (5,410,485), Ito et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/751,124

Art Unit: 3661

(6,233,520), Seto et al. (6,629,035), Fukuchi et al. (6,546,334), and Kondou et al. (6,882,933).

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Tan Q. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-6966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 5:30 AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached on (571) 272-6956.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to the Official Fax Center: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/tqn March 16, 2006 TAN Q. NGUYEN

rımary Examiner Art Unit 3661